

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks:

Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 22, 26 and 28 are cancelled.

Claims 29, 30, and 33 are the independent claims, with claims 29 and 30 amended and new claim 33.

Claims 4-6, 8-13, 16, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 31 and 32 are previously presented dependent claims.

Claims 7, 17, and 18 are amended dependent claims.

No new matter has been added.

#### **Specification Objection**

In response to the objection raised in the Office Action relating to informalities, Applicant amended claims 7 and 17 according to the Examiner guiding.

#### **Section 112 Rejection**

In response to the Rejection under section 112, raised in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 18 to overcome the rejection.

#### **Section 102 Rejections**

The Office Action rejected claims 4-13, 16-21, 23-25 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (Silva, hereinafter), US Publication US2002/0054090.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant redrafted claims 29-30 presented for examination to distinctively point out the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention.

Silva teaches a method for enabling a user to physically record his navigation actions while reaching a web page in one terminal (e.g. a PC), where the navigation actions are recorded as a "web view" file created thereby. The recorded web view can then be loaded or retrieved by another terminal (e.g. a cellular phone using WAP for browsing), using a different and probably a more limited communication network (See Silva, abstract and Paragraphs [0027-0029]).

As Paragraphs [0027-0029] by Silva clearly show:

*"If the user wishes to create a Web view for the Travelocity scenario earlier described, **he** starts a Web view recorder applet 110 running on his desktop, or downloaded from a remote site. He then goes to the main Travelocity (www.travelocity.com) Web site, **hits the Record button** on the applet, and browses to the itinerary page. **As soon as the Record button is clicked, the applet transparently records all his navigation actions. When the desired page is reached, he hits the Stop button, and specifies the content to be extracted from the final page** (e.g., only the itinerary details). At this point, the Recorder applet has all the information required for the Web view, which can be saved. After it is uploaded to the Web view server 101, the Web view is then accessible to any HTTP client. When the user wants to access this view from his PDA 106, he accesses the Web view server 101, which after authenticating his request, automatically navigates to the itinerary page at the Travelocity Web site, extracts the specified content from the page, and returns the extracted XHTML content (which PDA proxy 107 transcodes before it reaches the user's PDA 106). [0028] The Web views 101 server includes the following modules: 1) a Web view database 111, which stores Web view specifications; 2) a user profile manager 112, that performs user authentication for sensitive Web views stored on the server (e.g., a Web view that retrieves a user's 401(k) balance), as well as manages other aspects of the user's account; 3) a Web view scheduler 113, that periodically executes Web views (if so specified by the Web view requester); 4) a cache manager 114, that stores cached Web views; and 5) a Web view execution engine 115, that interacts with a Web view player 116, which together with a Web browser 117 and a Java script interpreter 118, retrieves Web documents and parses HTML pages; and a content extractor 119, which clips the components of interest on the*

*of retrieved Web page. [0029] To create a Web view, a user first specifies the Web page to be clipped. If the page requires multiple steps in order to be retrieved and does not have a well-defined URL, the user can use the recorder component of the Web view applet 110 to create the script to access the page. Using a VCR-style interface to transparently record browsing actions, a users can simply navigate his way to the final page while his actions (links traversed, forms filled along with the user inputs, and any other interactions with active content) are transparently recorded and saved in a smart bookmark. [0030] As described in the afore-noted co-pending patent application relating to smart bookmarks, during recording, if the user is required to fill out forms, he can optionally specify which field values are to be stored in the Web view specification itself, and which ones are to be requested from the user every time the Web view is executed. This allows the user to create parameterized Web views."*

According to Silva, in order to record the navigation actions of the user, the user is required to actively operate the recording by pressing a recording button. To record the navigation actions and creation of the web view, an applet application is required, as clearly specified in the quoted paragraphs.

The recorded navigations steps may then be transmitted to the mobile device or PDA of the user to allow reaching the same web view at the other terminal.

Conversely, the revised independent claims 29-30 and newly added claim 33 by the Applicant, teach, inter alia, a method and a system for identifying a contextual location of a the user, using a mobile device which indicates the sequence of hyperlinks used by the user to reach a requested URL and thereby enables indicating the user's history of navigation.

The contextual location is identified by extracting corresponding hyperlink titles from previously stored hyperlink titles according to presently requested URL; creating a short term user surfing course comprising a sequence of hyperlink titles

and a corresponding dynamic URLs sequence; and comparing the sequence of the user selected hyperlink titles with a plurality of known hyperlinks titles sequences stored in a predefined database.

The identified contextual location enables the proxy server to provide services, according to the manner in which the user has reached the requested URL.

As an example, the contextual location may be associated with a set of rules enabling to provide services according to those rules (e.g. billing, content type providing, access controlling, etc.).

The identification and recordation of the hyperlinks titles sequences are all carried out by the proxy server mediating between the content server of the content provider and the mobile device.

While Silva enables a user to record navigation steps or actions made in one terminal to reach a specific web page and transmitting these steps to be used by another terminal of another and different communication network (which is more limited than that of the first terminal), by using an applet to record these steps and create the web view – the Applicant enables a completely different operation for a completely different purpose.

According to the Applicant, the user is unaware and uninvolved in the storing of the hyperlinks titles sequences.

The Applicant provides a system and a method for identifying the contextual location of the user by **comparing hyperlinks titles sequence** of the user, when using the same mobile device, associated with a requested URL with other known hyperlinks titles sequences stored in a predefined database. When finding a known sequence that is compatible with the user's sequence - the identification of the contextual location is enabled, since each known hyperlinks titles sequence is associated with a predefined contextual location.

**The proxy server enables providing services according to the specific identified contextual location.** Different contextual locations may result in providing of different services to the mobile device user. **Silva does not enable identification of a contextual location and his object is not to supply services according to the contextual location. According to Silva, the navigation steps of the user are simply recorded by the user and used for reaching the same web view when using a different terminal.**

According to Rule No. 1.104 Nature of Examination (4) (c):

"(2) In rejecting claims for want of **novelty** or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified."

1. According to the Examiner's Rejection under 102, the Examiner argues that a part of the abstract by Silva which was inaccurately quoted in the Office Action as: "web view specification is saved at a web view server which includes the navigation steps used to arrive at the web page and extraction expressions containing components of interest" is equivalent to Applicant's action of: "receiving user visited content from a content server, the content exhibiting embedded hyperlinks each associated with a corresponding title and a corresponding uniform resource locator (URL)" (Applicant, claim 29 or 33). This is inaccurate for several reasons:

a. According to Applicant the "content" is retrieved while the titles of the hyperlinks are embedded therein" and not, as by Silva, the specification, which according to Silva's description include "smart bookmark 202 that is used to retrieve the itinerary page from the Web site...and navigation steps." (see Silva, Fig. 2 and paragraph [0030]). The titles and URLs of the hyperlinks extracted from the content

according to the Applicant's system and method are not equivalent to and cannot be deduced from Silva's navigation steps since the navigation steps by Silva do not include titles or any other content related text.

b. Additionally, the Abstract by Silva is different from the Examiner's quotation, quoting "In creating the Web view from a client terminal, a user accesses the Web page containing the information of interest **either directly or by recording a series of navigation steps** used to reach a final Web page from a first Web page." The recording of the navigation steps is carried out by the user, according to Silva, whereas according to Applicant, the hyperlinks titles and their associated URLs are stored and the storing is not carried out by the user.

2. According to the Examiner's Rejection under 102, the Examiner argues that a part of the abstract by Silva which was quoted in the Office Action as: "based on the navigation steps and extraction expressions, a web view specification is create" is equivalent to Applicant's action of: " parsing the received content and extracting the embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs, and storing the hyperlinks wherein each title is associated with its corresponding dynamic URL" Silva does not teach parsing the received content where each hyperlink title is **associated** with a URL, therefore these steps can not be considered equivalent and the Applicant's step of extracting the embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs cannot be deduced from Silva.

3. According to the Examiner's Rejection under 102, the Examiner argues that a part of the abstract by Silva which was quoted in the Office Action as: "When the web view server receives a subsequent request, the server retrieves the stored specification, **accesses the page indicated and extracts the relevant components**, and returns the information to the requesting device" and "the web view specification and extraction components" - are equivalent to Applicant's actions of: " upon receiving a subsequent URL request, extracting corresponding hyperlink title from previously stored hyperlinks according to presently received URL" and " creating a short term user surfing

course comprising a sequence of hyperlink titles and the corresponding dynamic URLs". Applicant enables receiving a requested URL and extracting stored titles of hyperlinks associated with the requested URL and thereby creating a surfing course through which the user has reached the requested URL. Silva, on the other hand, directly **accesses the page indicated and extracts the relevant components** (rather than accessing a database comprising hyperlinks titles according to requested URL).

4. According to the Examiner's Rejection under 102, the Examiner argues that a part of the abstract by Silva, which was quoted in the Office Action as: "When the web view server receives a subsequent request, the server retrieves the stored specification, accesses the page indicated and extracts the relevant components, and returns the information to the requesting device" is equivalent to Applicant's action of: "identifying mobile device user contextual location within content server by comparing the sequence of user selected hyperlink titles of the short term user surfing course with a plurality of hyperlinks titles sequences stored on a predefined database." Which is modified in this Response (without changing its meaning) to: "comparing the sequence of user selected hyperlink titles of the short term user surfing course with a plurality of hyperlinks titles sequences stored on a predefined database, thereby enabling to identify a contextual location by identifying a compatible hyperlinks titles sequence in the database, wherein each hyperlinks titles sequence is associated with a corresponding contextual location, and wherein said contextual location enables the proxy server to provide services, which correspond to said identified contextual location.".

Silva does not teach comparing sequences of titles of hyperlinks with known stored titles sequences associated with URL addresses for identifying the contextual location of the user. Silva, on the other hand, enables accessing the page **already indicated** (since stored while using a different terminal) and extracting components according to the specification. Therefore, these steps cannot be considered equivalent and cannot be deduced from Silva.

It is clear that Silva does not teach the invention according to Applicant's new claims 29-30 since Silva does not disclose a method for identifying a contextual location of a mobile device user for enabling a proxy server to provide services according to the contextual location. Silva enables a user to actively record navigation actions or steps navigated when using one terminal for enabling to extract those steps or actions when using another terminal of limited communication abilities (e.g. a cellular device using WAP based communication).

**For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Rejection under section 102(b) of claims 29 and 30 and in light of Rule No. 1.104 Nature of Examination (4)(c) is inappropriate.**

Applicant respectfully asserts that newly presented claims 29, 30 and 33 define over Silva.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-13, 16-21, 23-25, 27 and 31-32 also define over Silva by virtue of their dependencies on newly drafted claims 29 and 30.

In view of the foregoing amendments, revision and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Response and Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.



Applicant: KALISH Dan  
Application No.: 10/799,863  
Examiner: Jakovac, Ryan J.

Fees for a three month extension of time and RCE are believed to be due for this submission and are being paid via credit card. However, please charge any required fee (or credit overpayments) to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Account No. 500601(Docket No. 7044-X08-195).

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul D. Bianco/

Paul D. Bianco, Reg. # 43,500

Customer Number: 27317  
FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.  
21355 East Dixie Highway, Suite 115  
Miami, Florida 33180  
Tel: 305-830-2600; Fax: 305-830-2605  
e-mail: pbianco@fggbb.com